

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 were reported in the Office Action as pending. Claims 1-12 are rejected. Claims 1-12 are objected to. Claims 1-12 have been amended. Claims 1-12 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments to the claims and following remarks.

1. **Anticipation**

In the Office Action the Examiner contends that Claims 1 to 12 are not allowable since they are anticipated by *Susser* and *Encarnacion* under 35 USC 102(e).

In response, Applicant disagrees since *Susser* and *Encarnacion* fail to describe a computing device comprising a physical processing means containing a first virtual machine and a second virtual machine, which are distinct.

Indeed, *Susser* describes multiple contexts and subordinate contexts for one virtual machine. *Susser* even states that "a single virtual or physical machine must be used".

*Encarnacion* also describes multiple contexts, but does not teach or suggest use of two distinct virtual machines.

The applicant observes that *Kamiya et al.*, also fails to disclose the above-noted claim element.

Moreover, neither *Susser*, nor *Encarnacion*, discloses that the two virtual machines are separable only by destruction of the physical processing means and that each virtual machine is associated with a single corresponding execution profile.

Thus, Claims 1 to 12 are novel over *Susser* and *Encarnacion*.

**2. Obviousness**

The Examiner further contends that Claims 1 to 12 are not allowable since they are obvious over *Susser* or *Encarnacion* in view of *Kamiya et al.*

In response, Applicant notes that the missing features discussed above are to be found in none of the cited documents. Thus, no combination of any of the cited documents can teach nor suggest adding the missing features to those already known.

An advantage of the computing device of Claim 1 of the present invention is that security of the device is strengthened while a greater flexibility is provided for the applications hosted in this device.

Indeed, the computing device of Claim 1 provides two distinct virtual machines each dedicated to one execution space and to only one execution profile.

Thus, both execution spaces are perfectly independent to each other, whereas they are on a single physical processing means.

Both virtual machines can operate with identical profile type (for instance, two STIP profiles) or different profile types (for example one with a STIP profile and the other with a MIDP profile). As a result, there is a greater flexibility in the choice of the type of the execution space compared to the prior art.

The distinctive features also enable having applications (hosted in one virtual machine), which are independent from the execution profile of usual and/or ordinary applications (hosted in the other virtual machine).

Furthermore, having two distinct virtual machines with their own execution space and execution profile strengthens security of the system compared to the solutions given by the cited documents.

It should be observed that *Susser*, on the contrary, teaches away from using two distinct virtual machines [see column 11, first paragraph]. Indeed, *Susser* states that "a single virtual or physical machine must be used".

This proves that it is far from obvious for the person having ordinary skills in the art to come to the solution of Claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant considers Claim 1 and the dependent claims not obvious over the cited prior art documents.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims pending following entry of this amendment, namely Claims 1-12, are now in condition for allowance, which early action is requested.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date:

5/13/2010

By:




Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone (408) 720-8300  
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below

Linda Metz



6/15/2010